

The Antecedents of Chosen Joblessness

John B. Marks¹

University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, Portland, Oregon

Edward M. Glaser

Human Interaction Research Institute, Los Angeles, California

Four groups of men 18-30 pursuing life-styles without sustained paid work, hippie, biker, surfer, and criminal, were interviewed. The groups were contrasted with each other and with demographically matched groups who were working or preparing for work in terms of their experiences in family, school, and employment. Differences in class origin appeared among life-styles. The father's influence was most important among the family variables, influences of friends most important among the school variables. Experiences at work as such were less differentiating.

There is an admirable psychological test that requires no test equipment, no test blanks, and no memorizing on the part of the psychologist further than that required to remember the three words of a key question: "Who are you?" Aside from the obvious response of the name — and the subject is shortly given to understand that his interrogator wants more than that — the most common reply to the question is to give an occupation. Particularly among men. It is clear that occupation has been for many men, if not most, a crucial center of their identity.

But this is changing. Gottlieb (1974) summarizes the results of a survey of 1,860 graduating college seniors:

Most graduating seniors see work as an integral part, but not the most salient factor, of their lives.

As would be expected, men more often [than women] regard work as a central and salient part of life, but the difference is less than would be expected,

¹ All correspondence should be sent to John B. Marks, University of Oregon, Health Sciences Center, 3181 S. W. Sam Jackson Park Road, Portland, Oregon 97201.

given the continuous cultural and societal emphasis upon the man as the breadwinner and provider . . .

[Compared with a 1961 sample] the 1972 respondents seem more committed to the belief that interpersonal relations and family relationships are not to be sacrificed or placed in a secondary position to a career of work.

Others have seen this same change. Groves, Rossi, and Grafstein (1970) and Yankelovich (1970) on the basis of surveys of college youth conclude that vocational career interest is becoming secondary to finding purpose and meaning in life. Or as the placement director at Beloit (quoted in *Time*, May 24, 1971) puts it: "Vocational planning to them is anathema, an Establishment sort of thing to do. These kids don't want to start immediately on a nine-to-five job."

If college youth are withdrawing commitment from the job, blue-collar youth are asking for a job which will command their commitment. Schrank (1970) describes the new young blue-collar worker who demands work diversity, education, different time schedules, and elimination of outward signs of status differentials — such as work uniforms. Robert Ford (1969) describes the "obstinate employee" who is not likely to work very well unless his work has meaning. Sheppard (1971) documents the demand for variety and autonomy on the job, factors which the blue-collar worker formerly had to forego.

A Special Task Force for the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare (1973) has documented the "blue-collar blues" and "white-collar woes." They find the majority of both kinds of workers saying they would not choose their present occupation if they were to live their lives once again. Jenkins (1973) is being appropriate as well as provocative when he asks, "Does work *work* anymore?"

A particularly significant sign of the times has been the development of a number of life-styles which do not include paid work. In other words, many young people are choosing a career of nonwork just as many more conventional young people have chosen a vocation. These nonworking life-styles include the hippie or freak culture (Rubin, 1970; Simmons & Winograd, 1966; Smart & Jackson, 1969; Wieder & Zimmerman, 1974; Wolfe, 1968a; Yablonsky, 1968), the culture of the outlaw motorcyclist (Reynolds, 1967; Thompson, 1966), the surfers (Wolfe, 1968b), and the criminals. Each of these four alternative life-styles unites people who pursue similar activities and interests. The life-styles differ from each other but all of them have in common the characteristic that paid employment is devalued. These are lives without work.

The point of the present study was the determination of what experiences lay behind the decision to pursue careers without paid work. It is a psychological truism that family experience, school experiences, and the first experiences of employment can influence the choice of vocation (cf. Ginzburg, 1951; Krumboltz, undated; Roe, 1957; Super, 1953). Do these kinds of background experiences influence a choice not to be employed at all? The method of this study was to find young men from each of the four alternative life-styles (as well as some demographically matched young men who were working or pre-

paring for a career of work) and to determine whether the life-style groups differed among themselves or from the workers in family, educational, and work experiences.

The data were collected in 1970-71.

METHOD

Subjects

All our subjects were young men 18-30 years old. We took men because the expectations of the work role have been traditionally more explicit for men. They were recruited from two regions, coastal California and Oregon. These two do represent some regional contrasts, California with its experimental life-styles, and the more conservative Oregon. The sampling of the alternative life-style groups was not systematic since the geographic, ethnic, age, etc., distributions of such groups as hippies or bikers is unknown. The "straight" group of young men, who were working or preparing for work, was selected to match in certain demographic characteristics, described below, the samples of opportunity which we had from the alternative life-styles. Table I shows the numbers in the groups studied.

The Four Alternative Life-Style Groups

Membership in the first three of these groups was defined by the subject's identification of himself as belonging. They represent fairly well-defined sets of persons with shared attitudes, kinds of current activities and experiences, and a common distinguishing of themselves from the straights. Membership in the criminal group was defined by having recently come to prison to serve a sentence, but they, like the members of the first three groups, distinguished themselves from the rest of the world. They characterize the majority of people

Table I. Numbers and Origins of Subjects

Group	California	Oregon	Total
Hippies	14	16	30
Bikers	6	10	16
Surfers	25	5	30
Criminals	16	14	30
Straights	26	28	54
Total	87	73	160

outside of prison as straights and therefore different from them. We tried to achieve samples of 30 in each life-style group in order to have sufficient statistical power in comparisons among them and with groups of straights.

The Hippies. Actually these men called themselves "longhairs" or "freaks" (members of the free culture). We recruited persons who identified themselves with this group through several coffee houses, "head" shops, and communes. Sometimes one contact would lead us to one or more others.

The Bikers. These were members of "outlaw" motorcycle clubs, such as Hell's Angels and Gypsy Jokers, whose absorbing life-style prevented their fulfilling the requirements of a regular job. Because of their independence and wariness (they see interviewers, at best, as censorious representatives of the straight world, at worst, as possible police undercover agents), it proved possible to recruit only 16 persons for interview.

The Surfers. These included some ski bums from the Northwest as well as California surfers. All spent the major part of their time in sports activities. Some emulated Hal, the legendary surfer of Malibu, who picked up the necessities of his life in casual ways and was reputed to have never worked a day in his life. Others would work temporarily at some task (like shaping surfboards) which still enabled them to get out to the beach daily when the surf was up.

The Criminals. These are young men whose work, if it existed, took second place to their criminal activities. It was impossible to find a group of young criminals on the street, so we talked to 14 young felons in their first few weeks at Oregon State Penitentiary and to 16 men at the Chino State Institution for Men in Southern California.² We hoped that interviewing these men early in their imprisonment would minimize the effects of their being imprisoned on what they said, but we emphasize that this group does differ systematically from the others by the fact of their being in an institution. Their sentences were mostly for crimes against property, but there were some drug dealers among the group as well.

It should be noted that these alternative life-style samples were recruited from what was available to us and do not systematically represent all of any particular group. Indeed we do not know how one would go about taking a random sample of such a life-style group. There are no externally defined parameters to define the total population of hippies, for example. They are not analogous to rule-defined groups such as the paid-up members of Rotary Clubs in a given state or to demographically defined groups such as the population of white widows over 50 in a standard metropolitan area. Rather our alternative life-style subjects define themselves, like those people who identify themselves as mental patients by coming to a community clinic. Moreover, our life-style

² The authors are indebted to the superintendent and staff of these institutions for their cooperation.

subjects behave in such ways that other people identify them as a class, much as forgers may be defined by the notice which the police give them when their forging behavior becomes conspicuous.

Our sampling of the alternative life-styles definitely does not represent those who live in regions other than the West Coast nor does it represent those who are so alienated, busy, or wary that they will not take time to talk about themselves with a "straight" interviewer. We did, however, try to vary the sources of people we interviewed; we visited several communes and had contacts with several outlaw bike clubs. Through such study tactics we can be relatively sure that what we are describing is not merely a local variant. The geographic limitation to the West Coast, however, is a real one, and our results should be considered with this in mind.

The Straights

The straight groups were composed of young men whose backgrounds were comparable to those of the men in the alternative life-styles, but who were employed or in school preparing for a work career. There was a straight group formed for comparison with each life-style group. Each life-style member was paired with a straight of the same age, racial background, and family social class. The last was defined by the occupational level and the number of years of education of the main breadwinner of the subject's family, most often the father. Some individual straights were used in several comparison groups because they matched individuals in more than one of the life-style groups.

The first straight subjects came from sources we thought to be quintessential supporters of the work ethic: a junior chamber of commerce and a bible school. We found other straight subjects among the employees of a California department store, from employees of two local governments, from a medical school, and from a state university. Although our students were not working, they were definitely preparing for careers of work. They were matched for age and background with men in our alternative life-style groups who might have been expected to be in school had they not dropped out. Students were, in other words, suitable work-oriented comparisons for some of our nonworking subjects who, save for their countercultural orientation, might from their class background and age have been predicted to be students. Some kinds of straights were difficult to find. American Indians were an example. We were finally able to reach them through a Native American organization and an Indian interviewed them.

Interviewers

All the data to be discussed in this report were derived from interviews. There were 11 interviewers, all but one of them from the youthful age group

represented by our subjects. The one older person was a man of 45 who was studying social work for a second career. Nine of the interviewers were college students or had graduated from college within the last year. Three were representatives of the life-style characterizing our groups, one prisoner, one who had left jail just over a year before, and one student who was a hippie fringer.

One of the authors (J.M.) trained the interviewers. He interviewed the prospective interviewer in the standard way discussed below. He then reviewed the rating scheme and categorizations with the new interviewer, and they ironed out questions or points of disagreement. The new interviewer then received two pages of written instructions and went through an interview with an alternative life-style group member while the author looked on, and the two of them rated and categorized the data independently. Agreements and disagreements were discussed and, following this checkout, the new interviewer went to work independently. Both authors were available for questions and consultation.

The Interview

The interview was semistructured, designed to strike a balance between fostering subject spontaneity and covering all pertinent areas. All the questions were written out, but the interviewer had the option of varying the order or even the wording to accommodate the interviewee. The interview began with general questions to determine what was salient for the interviewee and passed on to more specific areas. Each interview began with an explanation of the purpose of the study, of the nature of the interview, and the assurance of confidentiality. Then the interviewer obtained a reaffirmation that the subject voluntarily wished to participate.

The first question invited the subject to tell about himself. He was then asked "What do you feel have been the persons and experiences that have influenced your attitude toward work?" Next came questions about how the subject usually spent his time and how he would prefer to spend it. There followed a section on what he thought was the ideal way to live. The next section, a rather long one, covered the subject's attitudes and experiences of work from his childhood to the present. There was a section then on his childhood and upbringing in general, followed by a section on the values of his family, his friends, and of himself. His education, his relations to women, and the economics of his present life formed the basis of the next sections of the interview. They were followed by questions on attitudes toward authority, routine, geographic mobility, and philosophical viewpoints. The subject was asked then about his experiences with the law and with drugs or alcohol. There followed questions about the persons with whom he was intimate or whose approval he wanted, and the interview ended with some projective questions about his attitudes toward work and toward himself.

The interviewers did their work usually where it was most convenient for the subject. This meant usually that the life-style subjects were interviewed on their home grounds, with some provision for quiet and privacy. The most frequent location for interview was where the subject lived, but many straight subjects were interviewed in offices, and the prisoner subjects were interviewed in a room attached to the prison counseling service. Time for the interview ranged from 1 to 4 hours depending upon the garrulity of the interviewee or the extent and complexity of his life experience.

The Development of the Data

The interviewer could extract some data directly from the interview either in numerical form (such as number of brothers and sisters) or in categories (such as the classification of the type of subject the interviewee enjoyed most in high school). Other data had to be developed from interviewer ratings following the interview. These ratings were on 9-point scales anchored only at the end points which were the conceptual extremes for that variable. For example, for "Responsibility for family work and chores" the instructions were: "Rate from 0 (none) to 8 (an excessive amount)." For the variable "Closeness of relation to mother" the instructions were "Rate from 0 (extremely distant or hostile) to 8 (extremely warm and close)."

Another frequently used numerical variable was that of occupational level. This had seven levels: 0. Unemployed or casual labor; 1. Unskilled labor; 2. Semiskilled (e.g., factory work, truck driving); 3. Trades; 4. Plain white collar (e.g., clerical, sales, small business owner); 5. Administrative professional (e.g., teaching, social work, medium business owner); 6. Executive-professional (e.g., law, medicine, large business owner).

Data Analysis

The four alternative life-style groups and the pooled straights were compared with each other on each variable. Each life-style group was also compared with its matched straight group.

For the numerical variables, comparisons were done by analysis of variance. The robustness of the F test (Box, 1953) allows its cautious use even with the nonnormal distributions of some of our numerical variables.

Categorical data, such as ethnic background, the type of discipline employed, and so forth, were analyzed by means of chi square. In some cases, as in classifying for what the subject's parents reinforced him, the interview information fell into as many as 20 different categories. These had to be combined to two or three groupings so that there would be expected frequencies for each cell adequate to make valid comparisons.

In combining categories, some general guides were used. The dichotomy between work-oriented (or achievement-oriented) and non-work-oriented was useful in combining responses to questions about activities. "Conventional" versus "unconventional" was used in classifying ways of obtaining life's necessities, and "superficial" versus "personal" classified identifications with parents and responses to "Who are you?" A similar dichotomy, used in other items, was between extrinsic and intrinsic. Behaviors which pleased or displeased parents or friends could be classified as achievement-oriented, conforming, friendly, or showing personal power. Areas of vocational specialization or of skill could be classified as "practical," like accounting or construction work, or "not practical," like skiing ability or fine arts. There were other combinations of categories specific to individual items.

Differences were calculated for each variable between each alternative life-style group and the straight group matched with it for age, race, socioeconomic background. Multiple comparisons were also made among the life-style groups and the group of pooled straights. Of 108 variables, 71 show significant differences among groups.

To find an empirical basis for organizing the differences which emerged between groups, a factor analysis was done. The 71 variables showing significant differences between alternative life-style and matched straight groups or among all five groups were intercorrelated. Five marker variables were added to indicate to which group an individual belonged: hippies, straights, etc., and three other family relations variables were added. The resulting 79×79 correlation matrix was then factored by a principal components program with diagonal elements estimated by an iteration procedure which began with the maximum off-diagonal element of the correlation matrix; 25 factors were extracted before the eigenvalue went below 1.0. These factors were then machine-rotated to an oblique solution in which the highest correlation between factors was .28 ($\delta = 0$). The first 15 factors all had eigenvalue above 1.0 and were mostly interpretable. They represented 62% of the common variance in the original correlation matrix. Table II shows the 12 factors in terms of which the results are organized and the variables with the largest loadings on each.

THE RESULTS

The results of the analysis are presented in terms of the variables which distinguish among the different groups. They appear approximately in career order, and the groupings are in terms of the factors on which the variables appear.

The first factor, however, is a career-spanning one containing 17% of the common variance of the original matrix. It is a factor of personal achievement on which the straight subjects load positively and alternative life-style membership tends to load negatively. Table III shows scores of the groups on the variables

Table II. Factors Used in Exposition of Differences and the Variables Showing Highest Loadings

Factor no.	Title	Highest loaded five variables
1	Achievement	College graduation, highest possible job, highest actual job, age, no barriers to jobs
2	Age and experience	Not single, number of children, years of bread-winning, age, criminal
3	Small family	-Birth order, -number of older brothers, firstborn, -number older sisters, H.S. graduate
4	Personal criminality	Arrested, convicted, imprisoned, criminal, has used drugs
5	Early work orientation	Occupational interest at 18, aspired high at 18, aspired above father, as a child felt work necessary, definite vocational interest at 12
6	Drop-out	-Years of schooling, -age left home, -older brother's education, left home for unconventional reasons, -good breadwinner
7	Criminal vs. hippie	Father reinforced for conformity as child, as teenager, -older brother's education, criminal-hippie
8	Close family	Good family work models, -social desirability of differences from father, child reinforced for industry, own job satisfaction, father's education
9	Generation differences	Father's education, level favorite job, -older brother's education, poor breadwinning record, -enjoyment of college
10	Surfer insouciance	-Marketability of skill, -practicality of skill, -occupational level of skill, surfer, -income per month
11	Biker	-Number H.S. friends, biker, older brother's education, years breadwinning, left home unconventional reasons
15	Bohemianism	Had consensual union, -straight, has used drugs, hippie, legally convicted

loading highest on this achievement factor. Two other variables related to achievement – the number of full-time jobs our subjects had held and the kind of satisfactions, intrinsic or extrinsic, they derived from representative jobs – did not show differences among the groups.

All of these are items favoring the straight group of subjects. They extend from high school experiences to the present. Two other items, the present occupational level of the subject's high school friends and his satisfaction with his performance as a breadwinner, empirically belong with this cluster, but they will be discussed later with other item groups to which they have both empirical and logical connections.

The second group of variables indicating a small family are loaded on Factor 3. Being a surfer is positively loaded on this factor while being a criminal weights negatively. The variables are shown in Table IV.

Table III. Personal Achievement

Variable	Pooled straights	Hippies	Bikers	Surfers	Criminals	df	F or χ^2
Enjoyment of high school (0-8 rating)	4.98	3.97	2.87 ^a	3.28 ^a	3.89	4/153	3.77 ^b
Success in high school (0-8)	5.49	5.34	4.00 ^a	4.17 ^a	3.89 ^a	4/153	9.56 ^b
Percent graduating from high school	93%	87%	75%	97%	50% ^a	4	32.20 ^b
Enjoyment of college (0-8)	5.57	3.56 ^a	4.11 ^a	4.16	3.78 ^a	4/103	5.18 ^b
Success in college (0-8)	5.75	5.17	4.22 ^a	4.48 ^a	4.25 ^a	4/103	3.86 ^b
Percent graduating from college	36%	17%	12%	10%	3% ^a	4	16.61 ^b
Percent having job training	61%	30%	12% ^a	24% ^a	30% ^a	4	21.58 ^b
Percent who took steps to enter a vocation	78%	33% ^a	62%	41% ^a	40% ^a	8	27.04 ^b
Percent seeing no barriers to getting jobs	58%	17% ^a	19%	24%	6% ^a	8	39.56 ^b
Mean percent time employed last year	71.91	34.03 ^a	36.87 ^a	36.46 ^a	38.36 ^a	4/150	11.46 ^b
Occupational level of highest full-time job (0-7)	3.21	2.78	2.75	2.55	2.00 ^a	4/154	3.77 ^b
Occupational level of lowest full-time job (0-7)	1.66	0.85 ^a	1.88	1.62	0.97	4/152	3.12 ^b
Occupational level of highest job fitted by training	3.93	3.40 ^a	2.94 ^a	3.03	2.30 ^a	4/159	9.17 ^b
Job satisfaction (0-8)	4.74	3.28 ^a	3.69	3.59	3.57	4/155	3.72 ^b
Satisfaction with own breadwinning performance (0-8)	6.58	4.62 ^a	5.71	6.43	3.93 ^a	4/62	6.07 ^b
Present occupational level of high school friends (0-7)	3.75	2.90 ^a	2.78 ^a	2.41 ^a	2.12 ^a	4/130	5.26 ^b

^aSignificantly below matched straights.^b $p < .01$.

Table IV. Small Family

Variable	Pooled straights	Hippies	Bikers	Surfers	Criminals	df	F or χ^2
Number of brothers and sisters	2.27	2.13	2.81	2.65	2.96	4/157	2.16
Birth order	2.12	1.43 ^a	1.81	1.38 ^a	2.31	4/157	3.34 ^c
Percent firstborn	38%	70% ^b	69% ^b	72% ^b	41	4	16.32 ^d
Number of older brothers	0.76			0.28 ^a		1/56	8.19 ^d
Number of older sisters	0.46	0.10 ^a	0.13 ^a	0.10 ^a	0.79	4/157	4.97 ^d

^aSignificantly below matched straights.^bSignificantly above matched straights.^c $p < .05$.^d $p < .01$.

All of the alternative life-style groups except the criminals have preponderance of firstborns in marked contrast to the straights. There are no significant differences among the groups in total family size. Although the hippies, bikers, and surfers have significantly fewer older sisters than the matched straights, the imprisoned criminals tend to have a larger number than their straights. Empirically related to this cluster of variables is graduation from high school which has already been shown to be primarily part of the achievement cluster and absence of sibling rivalry which will be discussed with the next cluster.

The quality of family relationships is this next cluster which, like the last one, loads significantly on being a surfer. This is our rotated Factor 8 and unites a number of variables which reflect family closeness (Table V). Good models in high school — or perhaps susceptibility to those good models — is another variable which is related to these.

These variables from the past distinguish not only the alternative life-style groups from the straights but also distinguish the life-styles from each other. The hippies criticize their parents for superficiality and are glad to differ from their fathers but say they got along with their sibling peers. The surfers show in the low social desirability of their differences from the parents that they are critical of themselves. The criminals tend to be critical not only of their families but of their high school models and of themselves. Not all family relationships differentiated the groups. Ratings of family harmony did not nor did it seem to matter who was head of the family.

Another set of variables reflects an early orientation toward work and the benign family environment in which this orientation developed. This is Factor 5 which has a significant correlation (.24) with the Achievement factor. This Factor 5 differs from achievement since it contains the chronologically earlier variables of vocational interests and family structure. The mean scores of the different life-style groups on these variables are shown in Table VI.

Among this set of variables, it is the criminal who deviates most from the straight norm, though the hippies deviate substantially, too. Some variables logically related to this cluster failed to differentiate the groups. Although family reinforcement for industriousness was discriminating, responsibility for family work and chores was not. And while identification with father was a differentiating variable, closeness to father was not, nor for that matter, closeness to mother nor to an older brother, and changes in closeness during the growing-up period were not related to group membership.

The next cluster of differentiating variables has to do with dropping out. It includes the negative of high school graduation, though that is fundamentally in the Achievement factor, and having used drugs, though that is on a life-style factor to be discussed later. Mean scores for the groups on variables of this Factor 6 are shown on Table VII.

Some school variables we recorded were unrelated to group membership. These included the subjects liked and disliked in high school, the college major,

Table V. Close Family

Variable	Pooled straights	Hippies	Bikers	Surfers	Criminals	df	F or χ^2
Percent without family breakup	81%	69%	75%	71%	62%	4	3.98
Sibling rivalry (rating 0-8)	3.04	1.96 ^a				1/50	4.38 ^c
Desirability of differences from his father	3.58	3.42	3.56	2.58	3.12 ^a	4/141	3.59 ^d
Family valued external, not personal things (%)	56%	77% ^b	75%	34%	65%	4	13.51 ^d
Good family work models (rating 0-8)	5.90	4.97 ^a				1/59	4.17 ^c
Extent family reinforced for industry (0-8)	5.49	5.30	4.33	4.43	3.55 ^a	4/151	6.76 ^d
Percent with good work models in high school	74%	32%	53%	46%	29% ^a	4	20.56 ^d

^aSignificantly below matched straights.^bSignificantly above matched straights.^c $p < .05$.^d $p < .01$.

Table VI. Early Orientation Toward Work

Variable	Pooled straights	Hippies	Bikers	Surfers	Criminals	df	F or χ^2
Percent with a defined vocational interest at 12	49%	37%	44%	59%	13% ^a	4	22.48 ^d
Percent having an area of vocational interest at 18	88%	69%	47%	62%	61%	8	16.86 ^d
Occupational level of job aspired to at 18 (0-7)	4.57	3.36 ^a	2.36 ^a	3.00 ^a	1.74 ^a	4/144	13.02 ^d
Percent aspiring higher than father's job at 18	56%	30% ^a	20% ^a	28% ^a	15% ^a	8	22.96 ^d
Percent showing identification with father	45%	8% ^a	43%	50%	27%	8	20.90 ^d
Obedience as child (rating 0-8)	5.53	4.30	3.63 ^a	5.38	3.73 ^a	4/158	6.50 ^d
Percent with parent drug or alcohol dependent	18%				48% ^b	1	4.64 ^c
Percent who explored vocations in high school	57%				25% ^a	1	4.23 ^c
How focused has his job exploration been?	4.83	2.73 ^a	4.06	3.10 ^a	2.90 ^a	4/163	8.76 ^d

^aSignificantly below matched straights.^bSignificantly above matched straights.^c $p < .05$.^d $p < .01$.

Table VII. Drop-Out Items

Variable	Pooled straights	Hippies	Bikers	Surfers	Criminals	df	F or χ^2
Severity of discipline (rating 0-8)	4.05	4.83	5.06	3.93	4.17	4/157	1.31
Age left home	18.2	17.9	17.0	18.6	16.0 ^a	4/140	7.08 ^c
Percent left home for unconventional reasons	20%	37% ^b	67% ^b	70% ^b	74% ^b	4	31.12 ^c
Years of schooling	14.7	13.5 ^a	12.1 ^a	13.6	11.6 ^a	4/153	9.56 ^c

^aSignificantly below matched straights.^bSignificantly above matched straights.^c $p < .01$.

and whether or not these young men had been encouraged in vocational choice by any school teachers or coaches.

Although severity of discipline does not distinguish the groups, it does appear with this group of variables. Since obedience is negatively loaded on this factor, it appears that the severe discipline did not work; it eventuated in leaving home early as well as dropping out from school. "Unconventional" reasons given for leaving home were such ones as "to get away from family problems," or "just to be on my own," as opposed to leaving home for a job, for marriage, for education or service.

Two factors, somewhat correlated (.12) but not very highly, had to do with a criminal career. The first of these is Factor 4. Being a criminal loads positively on this factor while being straight loads negatively. The variables of this set and the mean scores of the life-style groups are shown in Table VIII.

These seem to be the personal factors involved in criminality. Several other variables which are part of other clusters also are loaded on this factor. Thus obedience, which is associated with an early orientation toward work, is negatively related to these variables as is success in high school which has already been mentioned in conjunction with the Achievement group of variables. In addition, drug-use at some time is positively related to this group but will be discussed later in conjunction with some life-style variables.

The second factor defining our criminal group is one which can be conceptualized as contrasting criminal with hippie. Being one of our prisoners loads positively on this Factor 7 and being a hippie loads negatively. It distinguishes the heavy brushes with the law the criminals have had from the lighter drug and vagrancy encounters which have been the lot of the hippie. The variables are shown in Table IX.

These seem to be the socioeconomic factors associated with criminality; in fact, this set of variables could be labeled socioeconomic status. It is apparent that the surfers and hippies come from more middle-class backgrounds than do the bikers and criminals. The contrast between the criminals' fathers' emphasis on conformity and the hippies' fathers' emphasis on accomplishment goes along with Pearlin's (1971) generalization that the working class socializes the children for conformity while the middle class socializes for self-direction. It is noteworthy, however, that the bikers' fathers, typically at the skilled labor level, show no such conformity emphasis. Two other variables that have already been presented in the drop-out cluster (Table VII), namely, discipline and disobedience, also are linked with this present group of variables and fit logically with the conformity emphasis.

A number of family variables which failed to distinguish the groups should be mentioned. Mode of discipline, physical or psychological, did not distinguish nor did the independence our subjects were given in their upbringing. Although groups differed in class background, the economic comfort our subjects described from their childhood or changes in that comfort did not differ between

Table VIII. Criminality

Variable	Pooled straights	Hippies	Bikers	Surfers	Criminals	df	F or χ^2
Steadiness of life aims (rating 0-8)	4.78	3.30 ^a	4.25	4.07	3.41 ^a	4/158	3.77 ^d
Lack of realism in plans for future (0-8)	2.76	4.18	4.60 ^b	3.93	4.69 ^b	4/155	5.12 ^d
Percent whose high school friends reinforced power and appearances	29%	54%	53%	37%	74% ^b	8	18.27 ^c
Percent who have been arrested	41%	63%	69%	39%	100% ^b	4	34.19 ^d
Percent who have been imprisoned	7%	37% ^b	43%	24%	100% ^b	4	77.41 ^d

^aSignificantly below matched straights.
^bSignificantly above matched straights.
^c $p < .05$.
^d $p < .01$.

Table IX. Hippies Vs. Criminal

Variable	Pooled straights	Hippies	Bikers	Surfers	Criminals	df	F or χ^2
Father's occupational level (0-7)	3.90	4.17	3.31	3.86	2.73	4/154	5.48 ^b
Years education of first older brother	14.7	14.1	10.0	14.7	10.7	4/52	4.05 ^b
Percent whose father reinforced conformity as a child	36%	14%	20%	18%	63%	4	20.37 ^b
Percent whose father reinforced conformity as a teen	15%	10%	27%	30%	64% ^a	4	26.51 ^b

^a Significantly above matched straights.

^b $p < .01$.

Table X. Age and Experience

Variable	Pooled straights	Hippies	Bikers	Surfers	Criminals	df	F or χ^2
Age	23.7	23.1	24.7	22.0	24.3	4/159	2.70 ^c
Percent single	63%	62%	31%	82%	42%	4	13.91 ^d
Percent who have had consensual union	22%	73% ^b	67% ^b	55% ^b	85% ^b	4	38.32 ^d
Number of children	0.40	0.28	0.50	0.07	0.85	4/153	4.75 ^d
Income per month	487	220 ^a	245 ^a	210 ^a	504	4/148	8.53 ^d

^aSignificantly below matched straights.
^bSignificantly above matched straights.
^c $p < .05$.
^d $p < .01$.

groups nor did the number of residential moves their families had made. Family religion — at least in gross categories — and its importance to the family did not differ among groups.

A number of variables having to do with our subjects' mothers were unrelated to their group membership. These included her education, her occupation, what she reinforced him for as a child or as a teen-ager, how he would displease her as a child or as a teen-ager, and the social desirability of the ways in which he was like or unlike her.

Beyond family and school, most of our subjects grew up and went on to a variety of adult experiences with family and work. These are reflected in another cluster of variables, the Factor 2. It can be thought of as a set centering around age and experience. Although age actually has a higher loading on the first, the Achievement factor, it has the very highest loading of all variables which weight on this second factor. The variables of this group are shown in Table X.

The first two of these items, age and being married, reflect differences in our life-style groups. Specifically, they contrast the surfers, who load negatively on this second factor, with the criminals who load positively. Surfers and hippies are rather younger, less likely to be married, and have fewer children than the bikers and criminals. The straights, since they were matched with alternative life-style group members for age are intermediate on this variable, tend to have an intermediate percent married, and have an intermediate number of children. The experience of consensual union (a subject's living with a woman partner to whom he was not married) and income per month differentiate the life-style groups from the straights. It is worth noting that the criminals have slightly higher monthly incomes than the straights. Crime has paid.

It is worth noting this set of variables has to do with having responsibilities and being on the job, not with being particularly industrious or achieving at work. Job satisfaction has a modest loading on this factor but is more highly loaded on the Achievement factor.

A pair of job variables failed to distinguish the groups: the number of full-time jobs the subject had held and the classification of satisfaction — intrinsic or extrinsic — which he derived from the job.

There remain a number of differentiating variables belonging to factors which are relatively poorly defined or which are associated with one life-style or another. Factor 9 looks like one which has to do with intergenerational differences and perhaps to downward mobility. There are positive associations with the education of the father and with the occupational level of the subject's favorite job. There are negative loadings, however, on the older brother's education, on the subject's own enjoyment of college, and on how well he has done at breadwinning.

Factor 10 seems to describe the insouciant and impractical surfer. Variables having loadings on this include conflict with family on career goals and having unmarketable, impractical, and low-level skills. Factor 11 assembles variables

Table XI. Life-Styles and Others

Variable	Pooled straights	Hippies	Bikers	Surfers	Criminals	df	F or χ^2
Father's education (years)	12.9	14.2	11.1	14.0	11.3	4/136	3.08 ^d
Occupational level of favorite job (0-7)	3.14	2.55	2.73	2.48	2.38	4/145	2.31
Enjoyment of college (rating 0-8)	5.57	3.56 ^a	4.11 ^a	4.16	3.78 ^a	4/103	5.18 ^e
How good was he at breadwinning (rating 0-8)	6.69	3.08 ^a	4.47 ^a	3.78 ^a	3.00 ^a	4/94	13.60 ^e
Percent who ignored parental career goals for self	15%	37% ^b	36% ^b	37% ^b	14%	4	9.26 ^c
Percent with marketable skill	86%	70% ^a	75%	43% ^a	86%	4	18.53 ^e
Occupational level of skill (0-7)	3.59	2.45 ^a	2.00 ^a	1.00 ^a	1.76 ^a	4/156	14.61 ^e
Percent with practical business skill	48%	50%	93%	29%	68%	4	17.28 ^e
Percent with few or no high school friends	41%	23%	69%	63%	52%	4	13.71 ^e
Social desirability of likenesses to father (1-5)	3.55	2.88	2.88	3.48	2.84 ^a	4/143	3.25 ^d
Percent who have used drugs in lifetime	44%	97% ^b	85% ^b	86% ^b	87% ^b	12	59.56 ^e
Have quit or refused jobs for money or work conditions	33%	16%	21%	43%	70%	4	15.99 ^e
Percent resigned to barriers between self and jobs	4%	46% ^b	23%	61% ^b	38% ^b	8	27.36 ^e
Percent with ethnicity not Northern European	33%	31%	7%	10%	52%	8	18.25 ^d
Percent displeasing father by lack of achievement	33%	7%	9%	52%	30%	4	10.84 ^d

^aSignificantly below matched straights.^bSignificantly above matched straights.^cOverall chi square not significant but individual group comparisons with matches straights are.^d $p < .05$.^e $p < .01$.

distinguishing the biker life-style. Having few friends in high school loads on this factor. Factor 15 discriminates hippies from straights with loadings from socially undesirable likenesses to father and from lifetime drug use.

There remain four discriminating variables, having refused jobs for extrinsic reasons, being resigned to barriers between work and himself, being of Northern European extraction, and displeasing the father through a failure to achieve, that are associated with residual factors. All of these variables are shown in Table XI.

These groups of variables serve both to distinguish the alternative life-styles from each other and from their matched straights. The differences in father's education underline the socioeconomic differences between the middle-class origins of the hippies and surfers and the working-class origins of the bikers and criminals. Impracticality — about which they seem to be indifferent — characterizes the surfers. The high school friends item contrasts the quite sociable hippies to the more retiring bikers. Quitting jobs for extrinsic reasons pinpoints the materialistic preoccupations of the criminals and the percent of them whose ancestry is not Northern Europeans suggests some of the discrimination which may have underlain their lawbreaking.

The alternative life-styles collectively differ from the straights in a number of ways. They have not been good at breadwinning, if they went to college they did not enjoy it very much, mostly they ignored or resented parental vocational career plans for them, they have relatively low skill levels, and they are more likely to be resigned to the barriers between themselves and jobs than planning realistic ways to cope with those barriers. Most of them have used drugs at some time, although it is among the hippies that drug use is an almost universal experience.

DISCUSSION

The Norm of Personal Achievement

The variables of Table III present a picture of consistent success and self-confidence. It starts with high school, goes on through college and job, and continues to the satisfaction these young men felt and how they provided for wives and children. This is the hoped-for norm of growing up as a young man in America. Most of our alternative life-style groups have deviated from it, but so have many of our straights. So this is not the pattern of any single one of our groups even though being straight correlates positively with it and being a member of one of the alternative life-style groups correlates negatively. Being older is part of it but not the central part. The central variables seem to be those of academic and occupational success. It is what happens if nothing goes wrong.

Chronologically this pattern seems to start in high school. It involves both enjoyment and success there. It also involves being part of a friendship group of

like-minded youth who are likely to achieve occupational status later in life.

Family variables seem relatively unimportant in this pattern. The fact that family drinking problems correlate with it suggests that there are some kinds of family maladjustment which may preclude it, even before high school experience.

Some Demographic Considerations

The data on father's occupational level and father's education (see Tables IX and XI) make plain that there are class differences between the origins of the alternative life-style groups. (None, naturally, differ from the straights for these were some of the variables on which they were matched.) The hippies and surfers came from middle-class backgrounds while the bikers and criminals came from the working class. Moreover, many of the criminals' families were seriously disadvantaged while the bikers' families were typically from skilled working class.

Yet, as most of our informants recalled their childhoods, there seemed to be few differences between groups in the level of economic comfort which they reported. Most of the differences that seem operative were cultural differences between classes rather than differences in the perceived amount of material comforts which they experienced. It is a class cultural difference which accounts for the disproportionately larger number of criminals' fathers who were rewarding conformity. There are class differences in family size, a high level of father's occupation and education is associated with a small family. Yet, family size as such did not differentiate the life-style groups.

If family size was not important in these groups, where the subject stood in the family certainly was. Being firstborn was a demographic variable which differentiated all of our alternative life-style groups except the criminals from their matched straights. This is not the effect of other uncontrolled variables. Family size does not differ among the groups and the three life-styles are, of course, matched with their straights for age and social class. Schooler (1972) has argued that what may look like birth-order effects may be mere differences between social classes or between age cohorts in populations where changes in size or other characteristics of the family are taking place. These simple explanations will not account for the observed birth-order differences between the life-style groups and their matched straights.

What are the characteristics of the firstborn and how do they relate to our life-styles? Compared with later borns, the firstborn has been shown to be less aggressive (Sampson, 1965), more cooperative, more achieving academically (Altus, 1967), and more likely when under stress to seek out the company of other people (Schachter, 1959). They are, in sum, more socialized, more conforming, and more responsible — paradoxical set of characteristics for people who are to deviate from the mainstream. An explanation may lie in the child-rearing behind these firstborn characteristics. The relatively anxious interaction

of parents with their firstborn (cf. Rosen, 1961; Sears, MacCoby, & Levin, 1957), the dignity of his eldest position, the fact that he more frequently may have responsibility for younger children, and his higher frequency of interaction with adults within the family circle all suggest that he is under some greater pressure to be responsible and mature than are later children. The first child can respond to this in at least two ways: one is to accept the model the parents seem to intend (this, apparently, is the usual response) and the second is to shake off the responsibility, to rebel against it, even, like the hippies paradoxically, to demonstrate responsibility by using the rhetoric of a higher social calling to abjure the confining life task which seems to be laid upon him. These contradictory alternatives of response may explain some ambiguities of birth-order research.

Another family position variable that distinguishes the groups is having older sisters. The criminals are distinguished by having them more frequently than the other groups. This may have relevance to the *macho* image which the criminals wish to convey, since Koch (1955) has shown that younger brothers of sisters may have difficulty in developing the expected assertiveness of their gender role.

The Part Played by Father

Among the most significant family variables relating to later occupational choice are a number having to do with the father and the son's relations with him. It is noteworthy that none of the comparable mother variables showed differences between life-styles. For most of our subjects the father was the salient work model. He was the principal breadwinner in all groups, the family head, and the main disciplinarian. The mother's influence may have been important in emotional development, in learning expressive behaviors, but for the instrumental behaviors of work the father's influence and example seems paramount. Among the variables which distinguish our groups are the father's occupational level, his education, what the subject did as a child to please him, what he did as a teenager, what he did to displease him, the subject's identification with his father, and the social desirability of his likenesses to and his dissimilarities from his father. None of the comparable variables having to do with the subject's mother was discriminating.

How did this father influence come about? It may have come about through modeling, the father's simply being there as an example. This is supported by the fact that the variable "good family work models" is discriminating but weakened by the fact that "breadwinner's view of work" was not. From the prominence of the variables having to do with the behaviors which pleased or displeased father, which gained or lost his approval, it appears that much of the father's influence has been mediated through direct reinforcement.

It is interesting to look at changes over time in what the father reinforced in these sons. The criminals' fathers consistently more often than straight fathers reinforced for conformity during both childhood and teen-age years. There was a tendency for the other life-style fathers to reinforce more frequently for accomplishment. The fathers of the straights showed a shift between childhood and the adolescent years. By their sons' report, many who had reinforced for conformity during the childhood shifted with adolescence to reinforcement for accomplishment. The fathers of our alternative life-style subjects did not show this shift and, in fact, among bikers' and surfers' fathers the proportion reinforcing for conformity showed an increase. Whether this was a cause or a consequence of adolescent rebellion we cannot say; we suspect that it is the former since the lack of shift suggests a rigidity in the alternative life-style fathers compared with the appropriately flexible shifting in the straight ones.

There are some enlightening differences in the social desirability of our subjects' reports of their similarities to and dissimilarities from their fathers. Straights saw themselves resembling their fathers in desirable traits and being unlike where fathers' traits were undesirable. Criminals showed just the opposite pattern; they followed their fathers' undesirable traits but could not match the desirable ones. Surfers idealized their fathers; their likenesses were socially desirable, their differences undesirable. Hippies and bikers, on the other hand, devalued their fathers; their likenesses to them were undesirable, their differences desirable.

Two factors seem to operate here. One is the subjects' self-esteem. The straights have high esteem for self, so both their resemblances to their fathers and their differences reflect credit on themselves. Criminals, on the other hand, demonstrated low self-esteem by saying they lack father's good traits and take after him in undesirable ways. The other factor is the subject's valuation of the father. Surfers admire him, see his traits as desirable; hippies and bikers devalue him see him as not to be emulated.

The son's self-esteem seems to depend on the successes and accomplishments the son has had. It is highest among the relatively successful straight subjects and lowest among the defeated criminals in prison. This low self-esteem among criminals probably antedates the current defeat of being imprisoned. This would fit in with Aronson and Mettee's (1968) speculation that low self-esteem is a critical antecedent of criminal behavior.

The son's admiration for the father, on the other hand, seems to be related to how much the father encouraged independence in the youth and how much he encouraged a hanging on. It is interesting that hippies and bikers (the groups admiring father least) both perceived they displeased him through nonconformity as a child, while the surfers, admiring father, displeased through lack of achievement. It may be that the son's failure to conform reflects on the father as a defied lawgiver while the failure to achieve reflects on the self.

The influence of father upon the son's career development can be considered the outcome of identification: the son imitates the father, follows his father's course or, in the ambitious American mold, carries it on to a higher pitch of success. This is the pattern which the straights show: they aspire beyond the father. But all the alternative life-styles show a different pattern. Their aspirations at 18 were below the father's occupational level. They report now that their fathers were poor models for work, even though they gave rewards for industry (which the criminals's fathers did not). However successful the 'hippies' fathers were in their occupations, their sons saw them as discontented and unfulfilled, in a lockstep of work from which they could not escape.

Friends in Adolescence

If the influences of family on work careers are mediated through the father, the influences of school seem to be mediated through friends rather than through teachers or through studies. Doing well in high school, enjoying it, and graduating are all important but it seems to matter little whether teachers or coaches took an interest in his plans for the future or whether he liked or disliked various school subjects. The most important high school variables had to do with friends. The people-oriented hippies recalled having many friends in high school while the bikers and surfers had relatively few. Each one of the alternative life-style groups reported a lower present occupational level for their high school friends than did the matched straights. Apparently those who were to enter the alternative life-styles picked as friends people who, like themselves, were not headed for occupational achievement.

Perhaps the most interesting and significant high school variable has to do with the behaviors which our subjects reported as likely to please their friends. The behaviors can be grouped as they characterize different groups in the typology which high school students have made of themselves and their fellow students: the "soshe" who is interested in cultivating friendly relations with others, the "jock" who is interested in sports achievement, the "brain" who emphasizes intellectual achievement, and the "hood" who rebels against authority and restraints. Some typical soshe behaviors are being sociable and being attractive to girls. Typical jock behavior is athletic achievement, typical brain behavior is school achievement and creativity, while typical hood behavior includes such things as being cool, daring, or tough.

Peer reinforcement for rebellious hood behaviors was more frequent in all our alternative life-style groups than among the straights. It was, not surprisingly, the criminals who had a majority making points among peers by this means but the proportion of hippies was not far behind. Soshe behaviors were the ones encouraged among the straights, though the surfers had nearly the same percentage in whom these were favored. Both were far ahead of the un-

couth bikers and criminals of whom only about one in eight experienced this sociable pattern of appreciation. Both athletic and intellectual achievement were somewhat favored by the friends of the straights, but it was the surfers who had the greatest frequency of encouragement to be jocks while it was the hippies who were highest in frequency of reinforcement for brain accomplishment. It may be significant that reinforcement for independence, being self-reliant, was reported only among the bikers.

All of these peer-reinforcement patterns relate logically to later careers. This is in striking contrast to the failure of academic high school experiences so to relate.

Work Experiences and the Life-Styles

A common notion is that it has been discouraging and alienating experiences which have turned the alternative life-style people against work. Actually our results do not give much encouragement to this explanation. True it is that our life-style groups have had lower level jobs and the hippies have shown less job satisfaction than their matched straights. But these comparisons seem to come simply from the fact that the life-style people simply have fewer occupational skills and are lower on the occupational achievement variables of Table I. None of the groups differed in the types of satisfactions they had derived from their jobs. The straights were no more likely than the life-styles to cite the intrinsic motivator satisfactions (Centers & Bugental, 1966; Herzberg, 1966) such as the interest of the work, achievement, and so forth. Nor did the life-styles more frequently complain of having only extrinsic, hygiene satisfactions such as the pay or the workmates. Judged by the reasons they gave for turning down or quitting jobs, it seems not to be the lack of intrinsic satisfactions. The criminals, in fact, said they were likely to put up with intrinsic deprivations just so long as they had the extrinsic satisfactions of good pay and pleasant working conditions. The differences in work experiences of the various groups, in other words, seem less than what they expected; they are more like consequences of decisions against work that these men have already taken rather than the basis for those decisions.

How were the decisions made? And when? For our alternative life-style groups they seem just to have been adopted insensibly. One thing led to another and they were on a career which led away from work. As we have seen, the criminals, coming from disorganized families which often contained drinking problems, seem to have deviated early. Through neglect or deprivation they missed out on the first socializing experiences which could direct them toward a future occupation. For only about a third of them as children did work seem a necessary part of life. Only one in eight had any defined occupational interest as he entered adolescence. When they arrived at high school, they made delin-

quent friends. Only half graduated and many spent much of those years in correctional institutions.

Bikers chose their life-style somewhat later. Typically well integrated into their families as children and with early defined occupational interests, it may have been the high school years which set them off from the conventional life. Frequently they had difficulties in communication; many were relatively inarticulate and several were illiterate in spite of many years at school. In high school their verbal difficulties depressed both their achievement and their enjoyment, and they had relatively few friends. They were tinkers, and this tinkering pattern has been shown (Marks, 1954) to relate to social isolation in adolescents. They became rebels.

The decisions for the surfers, too, may have been made in high school. They had been early socialized, seemed close to their families, and by age 12 had the highest percentage with definite vocational interests of any of our groups. Although their schoolmates applauded their athletic achievements and almost all graduated from high school, they find as they look back that they did not enjoy that time. They had a few real friends and were frequently in academic trouble. This may be because, encouraged by their fathers, they had started with high achievement aims. At any rate, it was in high school that the challenge of steep slopes or big waves became more important for them than the social challenges of school or occupational achievement.

The hippies usually decided after high school. Typically they had had academic and social success there even though their many friends were not to be great achievers later. When the hippies went on to college, they continued to experience success, but the enjoyment was gone. Academic life may not have seemed relevant; certainly it did not give them the social intimacy and the kinds of mind-expanding experiences they wanted. The change to the hippie life-style became a timely solution.

These have been the typical courses, but, of course, no one life was typical. There were many individual differences within each of our life-style groups, though there was, naturally, enough homogeneity in each group to let the intergroup differences stand out. Each of our subjects was a combination of group likenesses and individual particularities.

REFERENCES

- Altus, W. D. Birth order and its sequelae. *International Journal of Psychiatry*, 1967, 3, 23-32.
- Aronson, E., & Mettee, D. R. Dishonest behavior as a function of differential levels of induced self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1968, 9, 121-127.
- Box, G. E. P. Nonnormality and tests on variance. *Biometrika*, 1953, 40, 318-335.
- Centers, R., & Bugental, D. E. Intrinsic and extrinsic job motivations among different segments of the working population. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1966, 50, 193-197.

- Ford, R. N. The obstinate employee. *Psychology Today*, November 1969.
- Ginzberg, E., Ginsburg, S. W., Axelrod, S., & Herma, J. *Occupational choice: An approach to a general theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.
- Gottlieb, D. *Youth and the meaning of work (Manpower Research Monograph No. 32)*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1974.
- Groves, W. E., Rossi, P. H., & Grafstein, D. *Study of life-styles and campus communities*. Preliminary report, University of Maryland, 1970.
- Herzberg, F. *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1966.
- Jenkins, D. *Job power*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1973.
- Koch, H. L. Some personality correlates of sex, sibling position, and sex of sibling among five- and six-year-old children. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 1955, 52, 3-50.
- Krumboltz, J. D. A social learning theory of career decision making. In A. M. Mitchell, G. B. Jones, & J. D. Krumboltz (Eds.), *A social learning theory of career decision making*. Final report, American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, Calif.
- Marks, J. B. Interests, leadership, and sociometric status among adolescents. *Sociometry*, 1954, 17, 340-349.
- Pearlin, L. I. *Class context and family relations*. Boston: Little Brown, 1971.
- Reynolds, R. *Freewheelin' Frank*. New York: Grove, 1967.
- Roe, A. Early determinants of vocational choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1957, 4, 212-217.
- Rosen, E. C. Family structure and achievement motivation. *American Sociological Review*, 1961, 26, 574-585.
- Rubin, J. *Do it!* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1970.
- Sampson, E. E. The study of ordinal position; Antecedents and outcomes. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), *Progress in experimental psychology research*. New York: Academic Press, 1965.
- Schachter, S. *The psychology of affiliation*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- Schooler, C. Birth order effects: not here! not now! *Psychological Bulletin*, 1972, 78, 161-175.
- Schrank, R. It makes no difference now. *New Generation*, 1970, 52, 14-21.
- Sears, R. R., MacCoby, E., & Levin, H. *Patterns of child rearing*. Evanston, Ill.: Row Peterson, 1957.
- Sheppard, H. Discontented blue-collar workers - a case study. *Monthly Labor Review*, 1971, 94(4), 25-32.
- Simmons, J., & Winograd, B. *It's happening - A portrait of the youth scene today*. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Marc Laird, 1966.
- Smart, R. G., & Jackson, D. *The Yorkville subculture*. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation, 1969.
- Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. *Work in America*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1973.
- Super, D. E. A theory of vocational development. *American Psychologist*, 1953, 8, 185-190.
- Thompson, H. S. *Hell's angels*. New York: Ballantine, 1966.
- Wieder, D. L., & Zimmerman, D. H. Generational experience and the development of freak culture. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1974, 30, 137-162.
- Wolfe, T. *The electric kool-aid acid test*. New York: Farrar Straus, 1968. (a)
- Wolfe, T. *The pump house gang*. New York: Farrar Straus, 1968. (b)
- Yablonsky, L. *The hippie trip*. Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill, 1968.
- Yankelovich, D. Understanding youth's new values. *Management Review*, February 1970, 44-49.